



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,924	10/02/2000	Shy Cohen	13768.604.7	3782
7590 06/22/2007				
RICK D. NYDEGGER WORKMAN NYDEGGER 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111		EXAMINER NGUYEN, HAI V		
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
		2142		
		MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE		
		06/22/2007 PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/676,924

Applicant(s)

COHEN, SHY

Examiner

Hai V. Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai V. Nguyen, USPTO Examiner.

(3) Wesley C. Rosander, Applicant's agent #: 51030.

(2) Andrew Caldwell, USPTO Examiner.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Masters # 6,374,300 B2; Hesselink et al. # 7,120,692 B2.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's agent, Mr. Wesley Rosander argued that Hesselink is not prior art because there is no support for the features relied upon by the Examiner in Hesselink's patent application(s). No agreement was reached as to whether this argument is correct. The Examiner identified various formal defects in the figures and specification.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ANDREW CALDWELL

ASSISTANT PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required